

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION**

HENRY A. CARDENAS,)	
)	No. 08 C 2452
Plaintiff,)	
)	
)	JUDGE ASPEN
v.)	
)	
CITY OF CHICAGO, and UNNAMED)	Magistrate Judge Brown
POLICE OFFICERS,)	
)	
Defendants.)	JURY DEMAND

**DEFENDANT CITY OF CHICAGO'S AGREED MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME
TO ANSWER OR OTHERWISE PLEAD TO PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT**

Defendant City of Chicago ("City"), by its attorney, Mara S. Georges, Corporation Counsel for the City of Chicago, respectfully moves for an extension of time to answer or otherwise plead in response to Plaintiffs' complaint. In support of this motion, the City states the following:

1. Plaintiff filed his complaint on or about April 25, 2008. The City was served with Plaintiff's complaint on or about May 2, 2008, thereby making the City's answer to Plaintiff's complaint due on or about May 22, 2008.
2. Due to administrative delays, the case was not assigned to undersigned counsel for the City until June of 2008, which was the first opportunity that undersigned counsel had to review Plaintiff's complaint.
3. Plaintiff's complaint lists as defendants, in addition to the City, "unnamed Police Officers." Those are the only defendants that Plaintiff lists in his complaint.

4. On June 26, 2008, this Court ordered the City to file a responsive pleading to Plaintiff's complaint by July 8, 2008.

5. On July 8, 2008, the City tendered documents to Plaintiff's counsel that should allow Plaintiff to identify as defendants those individuals previously named only as "unnamed Police Officers."

6. It is the City's position that since Plaintiff now has documents that should allow him to identify the previously "unnamed Police Officer" defendants in this case, Plaintiff should be able to amend his complaint within a short period of time. As such, the City requests that it be allowed to refrain from filing a responsive pleading to Plaintiff's complaint until the City is served with Plaintiff's amended complaint.

7. Undersigned counsel spoke with one of Plaintiff's attorneys, Gina Reynolds, by telephone on July 8, 2008. Ms. Reynolds said that she has no objection to the City's request for an extension of time to answer or otherwise plead.

WHEREFORE, Defendant City of Chicago respectfully requests that it be given an extension of time until ten (10) business days following the filing of Plaintiff's amended complaint to file a responsive pleading in this case; and for any other relief that this Honorable Court deems proper.

Respectfully submitted,

MARA S. GEORGES
Corporation Counsel
City of Chicago

BY: /s/ Thomas J. Aumann
THOMAS J. AUMANN
Assistant Corporation Counsel

City of Chicago, Department of Law
30 North LaSalle Street
Suite 1020
Chicago, Illinois 60602
(312) 744-1566 (Phone)
(312) 744-3989 (Fax)
Atty. No. 06282455

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have caused true and correct copies of the above and foregoing **Notice of Motion** and **Defendant City of Chicago's Agreed Motion for Extension of Time to Answer or Otherwise Plead to Plaintiff's Complaint** to be served upon Gina Reynolds at gina@katzlawchicago.com, via electronic mail, on this 8th day of July, 2008.

/s/ Thomas J. Aumann
THOMAS J. AUMANN
Assistant Corporation Counsel